

**Table 4: Campo Sewer and Water Governance Study**

**Summary**

| <b>Criteria / Options</b>              | <b>Option 1: Status Quo</b>    | <b>Option 2: Use of CSA No. 112</b>                    | <b>Option 3: Independent Special District</b>        | <b>Option 4: Private Ownership or Mutual Water Co. (Water Only)</b>   | <b>Option 5: County Sanitation District/County Service Area (Water &amp; Sewer)</b> | <b>Comment</b>  |
|--|--------------------------------|--|--|---|---|---|
| Ease of Formation                      | No formation required, +       | Requires LAFCO approval to activate Latent Powers, +/- | Requires LAFCO approval for District Formation, -    | Requires PUC approval for investor-owned utility for water service or Calif. Dept. of Real Estate approval for Mutual Water Co. | Requires LAFCO approval, +/-  | Option 2 may not be viable because of fire district consolidation efforts; Option 3: It is unknown if private water company would be interested in providing service; Option 4: Limited to water only, SD RWCQB does not permit private sewer operator; Option 5: LAFCO may prefer County Sanitation District or CSA. |
| Governing Board Options                | County Board of Supervisors, + | County Board of Supervisors with advisory board,-      | Newly-formed Independent elected Board of Directors+ | Private Corporate Board or Homeowners for water; sewer board is dependent on agency selected, +/-                               | County Board of Supervisors acts as governing Board for district, +/-               | Option 3 allows for local self-governance, if community is interested, Option 4 splits responsibilities with both public and private oversight; Option 5 allows for Board of Supervisors continuing role in a new capacity  |
| Ability to Provide Additional Services | No change, +                   | Requires existing CSA to provide new services, -/+     | Depends on type of district selected                 | Depends on particular private investor operated company for water, quality of sewer service depends on County involvement, +    | No change, +  | County has excellent experience with sewer systems while a private entity would likely have improved capabilities for water service   |

**Table 4: Campo Sewer and Water Governance Study**

**Summary**

| <b>Criteria / Options</b>         | <b>Option 1: Status Quo</b>  | <b>Option 2: Use of CSA No. 112</b>  | <b>Option 3: Independent Special District</b>  | <b>Option 4: Private Ownership or Mutual Water Co. (Water Only)</b>  | <b>Option 5: County Sanitation District/County Service Area (Water &amp; Sewer)</b> | <b>Comment</b>  |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| Experience                        | County has proven track-record; +  | CSA advisory board would be required to assist in the management of unfamiliar services; -       | Although many independent special districts provide excellent service, it is unknown how a new agency would operate; - | Depends on chosen parties, + (potential)   | Would allow for County's continued involvement, +                                   | County's continuing involvement with sewer service is preferred; water service could improve or decline depending on the party selected |
| Ability to Coordinate Growth      | Excellent, +   | Good, +/-  | Requires coordination and alignment of policies between two agencies, -  | Poor, fragments responsibilities between private and public sectors, -   | Excellent, +  | Options 1 & 5 preferred   |
| Fiscal                            | County continues to address subsidy, rates and long-term viability of systems, - | Complicates rate structure as residents may be receiving different services-                     | Independent community based Board addresses financial decisions, +   | Fiscal issues pertaining to water are transferred to private concern, various options for sewer are available, + | Allows County to remove General Fund involvement+                                   | The need for a continuing subsidy needs to be resolved; Option 5 allows the County to segregate costs                                   |
| Acceptance by Regulatory Agencies | None required, +   | LAFCO may prefer fire district consolidation rather than one CSA providing fire, sewer, water, - | Will depend on quality of the proposal and community support,-   | PUC or Dept. of RE to evaluate, +/-  | LAFCO may prefer County Sanitation District to independent special district, +/-    | Option 5 most likely to be accepted   |

**Table 4: Campo Sewer and Water Governance Study**

**Summary**

| <b>Criteria / Options</b>              | <b>Option 1: Status Quo</b>                   | <b>Option 2: Use of CSA No. 112</b>     | <b>Option 3: Independent Special District</b>               | <b>Option 4: Private Ownership or Mutual Water Co. (Water Only)</b>     | <b>Option 5: County Sanitation District/County Service Area (Water &amp; Sewer)</b> | <b>Comment</b>   |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| County Liability                       | Rests with County General Fund, -             | Multiplicity of services not optimal, - | Advantage to County by eventually transferring liability, + | Advantage to County for water services and sewer (unless status quo), + | Reduces risk for County, +  | Transferring services to other entities would significantly decrease long-term liability; Option 5 may serve to reduce general fund exposure |
| Ability to Address Future System Needs | County has resources to address operations, + | Varying demands, -                      | Unclear if funding will be made available, -                | Unknown, -  | Depends on residents ability to fund improvements, -                                | Not enough available information   |
| Community Acceptance                   | +   | unknown                                 | unknown   | unknown   | unknown   |  |
| <b>OVERALL RANKING</b>                 | <b>2</b>                                      | <b>5</b>                                | <b>4</b>  | <b>3</b>  | <b>1</b>  |  |